

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/517,884	12/13/2004	David Peasley	A2682	1375
75	7590 03/23/2006		EXAMINER	
Paul E Milliken			KRAMER, DEVON C	
9061 Wall Street NW Massillon, OH 44646-1676			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3683	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
065 - 4 - 4 - 0	10/517,884	PEASLEY, DAVID				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Devon C. Kramer	3683				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn fro 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8,10 and 11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2) Claims 1-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matteis et al (WO 98/40640).

IN re claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10, and 11, Matteis et al provides a parking brake assembly which includes a lever (15) for operation of a brake shoe to provide a parking function, the lever carrying an automatic latching device for automatically latching to the lever an end fitting (20) on an operating cable and a guide spring (25) extending from an associated brake backplate into contact with the lever, the automatic latching device comprising a latching member (22) mounted on the lever which is deflected aside by the end fitting as the cable is fed in a first direction towards the lever within the guide spring and which latches behind an abutment on the end fitting to latch the cable to the lever so that subsequent movement of the cable in a second direction opposite to the first direction moves the lever to operate the parking function, the assembly being characterized in that an end of a spring (23) which contacts the lever is shaped to also act on the latching member to bias the latching member towards the position in which it latches behind the abutment on the end fitting. Please note that Matteis et al lacks the

Art Unit: 3683

teaching of the guide spring biasing both the latching member and the cable. Matteis et al uses separate springs to perform this function.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the guide spring of Matteis et al to bias the latching member merely to reduce the number of parts in the device and since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard V. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1993).

In re claim 2, see figurer 4.

In re claims 3, 6, see figures 3A-3C.

3) Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matteis et al (WO 98/40640) in view of Evans (5180037).

Matties et al lacks the teaching of the lever assembly in a drum in disc brake.

Evans teaches a lever assembly in a drum in disc brake.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the lever assembly of Matteis et al in a drum in disc brake merely to provide a means to connect the cable which is easy to assemble and which provides a positive lock.

Art Unit: 3683

Conclusion

- 4) The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shellhause, Parker et al and Jones all provide cable assemblies with brakes.
- 5) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devon C. Kramer whose telephone number is 571-272-7118. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James McClellan can be reached on (571)272-6786. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Devon C Kramer Primary Examiner Art Unit 3683

3/20/06

DK